

REMARKS

Claims 1–12 are pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1–10 and 12 were allowed, and Claim 11 was rejected.

In this Amendment, Claim 11 is amended. No new matter was introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1-10 and 12 are allowed and Claim 11 is at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Barr et al. (“Barr”) (U.S. Patent No.: 6869361 B2). Although Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, Claim 11 has been amended to clarify the invention and remove any ambiguities that may have been the basis for this rejection.

Claim 11 is directed to a method for discharging liquid through a head including a plurality of liquid dischargers having nozzles aligned in a predetermined direction.

As amended Claim 1 recites “controlling the discharge of droplets from at least one of the other liquid dischargers by deflecting a trajectory of a droplet discharged from the liquid discharger to which the liquid discharge signal was transferred, wherein the head is capable of deflecting the trajectory of the droplet discharged from the liquid discharger with various amplitudes along a predetermined direction and by discharging droplets from at least two of the liquid dischargers in the vicinity onto the same pixel area.”

In the allowable subject matter section, the Examiner indicated that the primary reason for allowance is the inclusion of the limitations of a liquid discharge that includes a deflecting unit for deflecting the trajectory of a droplet discharged from one of the liquid dischargers in a predetermined direction and commanding at least two of the liquid dischargers in the vicinity to discharge droplets onto the same pixel area. This limitations cited by the Examiner has been added to Claim 11.

Moreover, Barry fails to teach or disclose a control of the discharge of droplets from at least one of the other liquid dischargers, by deflecting a trajectory of a droplet discharged from the liquid discharger to which the liquid discharge signal was transferred.

Thus, Claim 11 is allowable over Barry, and Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (c) rejection of claims be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 6, 2006

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No.: 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

14489067/V-1